

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2023
1:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Via Zoom

Attendees:

Heidi Borders, Chiu Liu, Tom Mattson, Tracy Coan, Maria Bhatti, Robert Peterson, John Asuncion, Mallory Atkinson, Ruchita Acharya, Colleen Vidinoff, Rebecca Neves, Dale Benson,

Joe Wang, City of Oakland

Tim Nguyen and Russell Chen, County of Santa Cruz

Kenneth Jones and Bob Burch, City of San Fernando

Note: Decisions and Action items in boldface

Item 1. Welcome and Committee Updates

- Welcome extended to all attendees, roll call taken and agenda reviewed. (Note: Several members were in a CTC meeting and joined this meeting late.)

Item 2. Project RFA Extension Requests: City of Oakland, County of Santa Cruz, City of San Fernando, and City of Los Angeles. Detail of each project's status, challenges, and requested time extensions below.

2a. City of Oakland

Joe Wang presented the extension request for project H9-04-022.

The purpose of this project is to improve pedestrian safety at three intersections with existing uncontrolled crosswalks in Oakland (7th/Filbert, 98th/C, and Oakland/Moss).

The scope of this project is to install rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), associated signage, paper markings, and possible bulb outs at these intersections.

The cost of this project is \$747,000. \$250,000 is covered by a grant and the remaining \$497,000 will be covered by local funding.

Challenges are resource and not design restraints. Project was awarded at end of 2019. Shortly after, the team took on new programs created in response to COVID-19 impacts. Resources went to slow streets to increase outdoor space, sideshow prevention, and a rapid response program to mitigate the number of serious and fatal pedestrian crashes. An additional challenge is the need to design around a PG&E underground utilities vault at the 7th/Filbert location.

Revised schedule:

- Environmental clearance is complete
- In-house design to be completed by end of April 2023
- Field Review form needs to be signed by local office
- Utilities review needs to take place
- CON RFA package to be submitted by December 30, 2023, hopefully sooner

2b. County of Santa Cruz

Tim Nguyen presented the extension request for project H9-05-011.

The purpose of this project is to replace existing substandard guardrail at various locations throughout Santa Cruz County to improve traffic and fire safety.

The scope of this project is to upgrade the existing guardrail installed in the 1960s to the Midwest Guardrail System. Replacing deteriorating wood posts with steel posts will also improve fire safety as evidenced by the destruction of wood posts in the fires of 2020.

The cost of this project is \$364,000 (with 10% contingencies).

Challenges are additional time needed to determine right of way or drainage easement needs due to the nature of nature of the updated guardrails. Time is also needed to determine utility conflicts and calculations for other items of work, such as road excavation.

Revised schedule:

- PE to be completed by April 30, 2023
- CON RFA package to be submitted by July 31, 2023
- Construction to begin by mid to late summer
- Project to be completed by December 31, 2023

Presentation was followed by discussion about why project was so delayed. Tom Mattson mentioned the significant storm damage in Santa Cruz County and asked if the December deadline was reasonable in light of this. Russell Chen, from Santa Cruz County, said that since 2017, there have been over 200 storm damage sites which were prioritized. This year, there have been 80 storm damage sites. Tim said he believes the schedule he outlined is feasible.

2c. City of San Fernando

Kenneth Jones presented the extension request for project number H8-07-046.

The purpose of this project is to increase safety for motorists and pedestrians by making traffic signal improvements at nine significant intersections within a dense area of the city that directly intersects with Metrolink trains.

The scope of this project includes installation of larger signal heads, additional street lighting, and turn signal phasing where there are currently left turns.

The cost of this project is \$897,000 (\$1.03 million approved for CE & Construction). Construction costs to implement most of CPUC requests, including traffic control implementation, is approximately \$150,000. Current inflation could increase construction costs upwards of \$75,000-\$100,000.

Challenges are obtaining railroad concurrence and approvals. Initial contact with SCRRA-Metrolink began August 25, 2021. The GO-88 application was submitted to SCRRA-Metrolink for final signatures on December 6, 2022. There has been no response. An additional related challenge is getting the city to prepare a Construction and Maintenance agreement with the railroad.

Revised schedule:

- RR approval/permits/C&M agreement by January 31, 2023
Note: This was not received so need to kick the date out 2 months.
- Request for Right of Way Certification by February 14, 2023
- Caltrans review and Right of Way Certification by May 16, 2023
- CON RFA package to be submitted by May 30, 2023
- Caltrans review and return E-76 by July 25, 2023

2d. City of Los Angeles

There was no representative from the City of Los Angeles to present extension request for project LA H08-07-024 - Signal Timing improvements. The original CON date was September 30, 2022. Rebecca Neves asked if there were any letters presented to request extension. Chiu Liu said he has not received anything. Tom Mattson asked if there is a time limit for requesting an extension, particularly if request is past project completion date. Is there a case in which project would be cancelled? Dale Benson said he would talk to colleagues in District 7 and see what he could find out about status of project and extension request.

3. California Local Highway Safety Improvement Program (HISP) Advisory Committee Charter

Robert Peterson said he had reviewed the Charter to make sure it was in line with what the advisory committee is about. He sent out his edits and requested feedback.

Tom Mattson suggested adding the commitment to zero deaths, aligning with the SHSP goal to reach zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2050, to the Charter's mission. Robert Peterson agreed.

Robert noted he made the following edits:

- Under Frequency of Meetings, changed “will meet” six times annually to “scheduled to meet” six times annually, with note that additional meetings can be called or canceled as necessary.
- Under Reporting Structure, added that committee makes recommendations to the Division Chief “or designee.”
- Under Recommendation Process, changed “Recommendation Process” to “Decision Process.” Also changed “decisions by the committee” to “recommendations by the committee.” Changed “action is approved” to “recommendation is approved.” John Asuncion asked that wording be changed from “seven yes votes will be required” to “yes votes by a majority of attending members will be required.”

The committee agreed that revised Charter should be sent out for committee signatures.

There was a brief discussion about lack of attendance at the committee meetings by certain cities. Robert said he would bring up attendance with League of Cities. Mallory Atkinson asked if RTPA representatives need a reminder to attend. Robert will work with the chair of RTPA from San Joaquin County to address representation. Tom said the original goal was to have rural/urban (counties) as well as north/south (cities) represented on the committee. Rebecca Neves added that it has been hard to find Southern California city representatives.

Update on H3R and VRU Obligations

Last time, Maria Bhatti presented what these obligations mean and what can trigger them. Robert Peterson said that this year we were notified that High Risk Rural Roads (H3R) and Vulnerable Road Users (VRU) were triggered. We reviewed which current projects from Cycles 8 and 9 meet this requirement but found they had already gone through and could not be changed. Given that there are two years to obligate those funds and funds remain on the books if process is in place, we can look at Cycle 10 projects and determine if they can be federalized. For Cycle 11, we can let agencies know we need to federalize their H3R (around \$17 million) projects, and they cannot move forward with just State funds.

The State has committed to obligating all the funding, around \$47 million dollars, for VRU. There are some late Cycle 9 projects as well as many complete streets projects that would qualify. We are working with someone from the budget office to obligate these funds.

Delayed Projects

Chiu Liu reported that there are only four delayed projects. Requests for Cycle 9 extensions will not be reviewed until December 2023.

Robert Peterson stated there are 89 federalized projects on the books. We may get more in Cycle 11. The list will refresh in March. Out of a \$61 million dollar obligation, \$1.3 million has been used. \$58 million dollars should be enough to cover for this fiscal year.

Robert said we overdelivered on our OA by \$38 million dollars. However, even though the OA funds list is expected to go into the negative, there are apportionments from past legislative bills that can be used.

Summary of Local HSIP Cycle 11 Projects

Robert Peterson said that in the last cycle, a press release on selected projects went out to all 12 districts. Then each agency/district tailored the press release for their local constituents.

Robert presented a summary which includes project selection criteria, applications received, and applications selected for funding.

- 434 applications were received from 206 local agencies.
- 282 (65%) applications were selected for funding from 155 agencies (75%) for a total of \$225.6 million in HSIP funds. (Note: This does not include 10% match which allowed us to fund 20 more applications.)
- Of the 282 applications selected, 162 (totaling \$187.8 million in HIP funds) were selected based on their Benefit Cost Ratios (BCRs). The BCR cutoff for an application to be selected for funding is 18.0. The average BCR of the selected applications is 35.5.
- 120 applications (totaling \$37.7 million in HSIP funds) were selected for funding under the set asides for Ped Crossing Enhancements, Guardrail Upgrade, Installing Edgelines, Bike Safety Improvements, and Tribes.
- 216 applications (77%) (totaling \$193.8 million in HSIP funds (85.9%)), are within Disadvantaged Community (DAC) vicinities. (Note: A project is considered within DAC vicinities if the applicant has DACs within its boundaries, even though the project locations may not be in a DAC.)
- 168 projects have pedestrian/bike improvements.

- Safety improvements include but are not limited to:
 - Safety improvements at signalized and non-signalized intersections
 - Pedestrian/bike projects
 - Roadway safety improvements

Robert noted that this summary can be used to tell a story of what we are funding. He made a presentation to the Executive Committee and let them know we are very efficient in our funding. The average project cost is \$945,000. The Executive Committee was surprised with the BCR cutoff of 18 which translates into a safety index of 1800.

Robert also presented a chart with the number of projects distributed by district. He noted that District 8 (San Bernadino) is in the top five of fatal and serious injuries. It submitted \$10 million in projects, and all were selected. Out of 16 projects, 9 have pedestrian safety improvements. 65% of funding was awarded to cities and 35% to counties.

Maria Bhatti asked if the BCR cutoff was so high because of fatalities or could it also have to do with funding to local sites. Do we want to go back and reevaluate funding split? Robert noted that H3R will be around a while and said committee may want to see how many of the 282 projects are H3R and how many were not funded because of being below the cutoff? Should we fund more until we get off trigger list? Tom Mattson said it is difficult to consider shifting funds because everyone is underfunded. We should keep looking at getting more funding rather than taking from one to fund another.

Robert and Chiu Liu noted there are 32 agencies that are new to the program. The list of agencies has not been released for sharing yet but hopefully will be in a week or two.

Roundtable

Tom Mattson would like to discuss timeliness protocol for filing an extension at a future meeting. Rebecca Neves would also like to address lack of agency responsiveness. Robert noted that the Division Chief wants to work with agencies to help them be successful. As an advisory committee, we have done well helping agencies realize they need to come to the committee.

Robert Peterson said once the Cycle 11 list comes out, we will need to start to think about Cycle 12.

Chiu Liu will send out the Summary of Local HSIP Cycle 11 Projects and also the list of agencies that applied for the first time (for internal use only until press release comes out).

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm.

Next Meeting:

1:00 – 3:30 pm, March 23rd, 2023